

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/315,796

Applicant(s)

Davis et al.

Examiner

Stephen R. Funk

Group Art Unit

2854

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Stephen R. Funk

(3) Ray Prince

(2) Robert Falk

(4) _____

Date of Interview May 9, 2000

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description:

Mr. Falk and, in particular, Mr. Prince gave background discussion and theory for the disclosed invention. Mr. Prince also demonstrated how a printed sheet could be considered as 4 colors "over" 2 colors i.e. 4 on one side and 2 on the other.

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: In general

Identification of prior art discussed:

DeMoore et al. (US 5,960,713) and (EP 741,025)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Falk argued that DeMoore et al. ('713) cannot rely on the full disclosure of parent SN 08/435,798 since they do not have identical disclosures or disclosures that can be easily compared for similar subject matter. Mr. Falk refers to the Penwalt decision. Discussed that alternative meanings of "over" could be perfecting or on top of, that a "continuous in-line process" refers to complete processing of the substrate (would be completely printed whether both sides or not), and that perfecting printing is widely conventional and desirable in the art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.


STEPHEN R. FUNK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.